



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,996	03/16/2004	William R. Gladney	G00011	1425

7590

05/04/2005

Neal T. Hauschild
4310 Sunbury Rd.
Galena, OH 43021

EXAMINER

CINTINS, IVARS C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1724

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,996

Applicant(s)

GLADNEY, WILLIAM R.

Examiner

Ivars C. Cintins

Art Unit

1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1724

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-7 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teranishi (U.S. Patent No. 4,622,142) or Yanagihara (U.S. Patent No. 4,660,393) in view of Knauf et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,510,031). As pointed out in the previous Office action, Teranishi and Yanagihara disclose water filtration devices for a clothes washing machine, which devices include a housing defining a filtration chamber, and a replaceable filter cartridge in this chamber. Accordingly, each of these primary references discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the dual filtration chamber and the separate hot and cold water inlets and outlets. Knauf et al. discloses a water filter, and teaches providing separate inlets to the filter for hot and cold water (see Fig. 3 and col. 3, lines 11-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the filtration device of either Teranishi or Yanagihara with separate inlets for hot and cold water, as well as separate outlets and filtration chambers for hot and cold water, in order to better control the filtration of the water supplied to the washing machine in either of these primary reference systems. Such modification is deemed to be obvious since washing machines typically include cycles which utilize only hot water, or only cold water, to wash clothing; and therefore, such separate hot and cold water inlets, outlets and filtration chambers would be capable of ensuring that the water delivered to the washing tub is adequately purified.

Claims 3, 4 and 8-13 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teranishi or Yanagihara in view of Knauf et al. as applied above, and further in view of Poirier (U.S. Patent No. 6,337,015). As pointed out in the previous Office action, each of the modified primary references discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the recited filtration materials (claims 3, 4 and 11-13) and mounting means (claims 8-10). Poirier discloses a filter for an appliance, and teaches the recited filtration materials (see col. 8, lines 13-18) and mounting means (see col. 6, lines 21-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the filtration device of Poirier for the filtration device of either modified primary reference, since the filtration device of Poirier is capable of filtering water in substantially the same manner as the filtration device of either modified primary reference, to produce substantially the same results. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount this filtration device to the washing machine of either modified primary reference in the manner taught by Poirier, in order to facilitate the installation and maintenance of this filtration device.

Applicant's arguments filed February 22, 2005 have been noted and carefully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive of patentability. Applicant argues that the prior art references fail to suggest the claimed invention because these references disclose filters having only one filtering chamber and only one outlet. It is pointed out, however, that since washing machines typically include cycles which utilize only hot water or only cold water to wash clothing, one of ordinary skill in the liquid filtration art would readily recognize that separate hot and cold water inlets, outlets and filtration chambers would be capable of providing better filtration and temperature control of the particular type of water supplied to the washing

Art Unit: 1724

machine. Accordingly, this skilled artisan would have been modified to provide the filtration device of either Teranishi or Yanagihara with separate inlets, outlets and filtration chambers for hot and cold water, as proposed above.

Applicant also argues that the bypass mechanism of Knauf is clear evidence that a dual filter chamber is not capable of achieving the filtering results as the subject invention. Again, this argument has been noted and carefully considered, but is not deemed to be persuasive of patentability. It is pointed out that Knauf only teaches one embodiment (i.e. Fig. 4) wherein the hot water bypasses the filter element. In the other disclosed embodiment (see Fig. 3) the hot water is clearly filtered by passing through the filter element (see col. 3, lines 11-15); and given this teaching, one of ordinary skill in the liquid filtration art would have been motivated to modify the systems of either Teranishi or Yanagihara in the manner proposed above.

Snell (U.S. Patent No. 606,592) discloses a multi-chamber water filter having a plurality of inlets and outlets (see page 2, right column, lines 53-57).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,


Art Unit: 1724

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to I. Cintins whose telephone number is (571) 272-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Duane Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-1166.

The centralized facsimile number for the USPTO is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Ivars C. Cintins
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

I. Cintins
May 1, 2005